

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 127948/FH/2020

Date registered valid: 9 September 2020

Proposal: Erection of a part single/part 2 storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.,

Address: 27 Homestead Crescent, Manchester, M19 1GJ

Ward(s): Didsbury East Ward

Applicant: Mr. Numan Jilani, 27 Homestead Crescent, Manchester, M19 1GJ

Agent (if any): Mr Niamat Ali, NA Design & Construction Ltd, 47 Egerton Road South, Chorlton Cum Hardy, Manchester, M21 0YW

Case officer: Constance Phillips
Tel: 0161 234 5792
Email: constance.phillips@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve

Date of recommendation: 13 November 2020

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: Photos received with application

Standard consultations: No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications: Printed: 11 September 2020 Expired: 2 October 2020

Site notice: No site notice has been produced

Press advert: No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse of red brick and white render with a pantile gable roof, a bay window and porch canopy to the front and detached garage/outbuilding to the rear. The plot includes a front garden, driveway and rear garden.

Description of area

Homestead Crescent is residential in nature and lies parallel to Kingsway within the Didsbury East ward. The area is characterised by semi-detached family dwellinghouses with gardens.

Description of development

The applicant wishes to build a part single part two storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation, in the form of a 4th bedroom, additional bathroom and a larger kitchen.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents, as per appendix 1 – Two comments were received, 1 objection and 1 neutral.

Objection – *This is a rented house that has had no upkeep at all whilst the tenants have lived there. I would be concerned about the number of people who would eventually live in the house.*

Neutral comment – *The property is and has been rented property along with the adjacent and connected one for over 15 years. During the last tenancy the occupants caused a substantial amount of difficulties for the community in terms of parking issues and traffic congestion. The*

previous tenancy regularly had in excess of 3 vehicles, with relatives often remaining overnight at the property for extended periods of time. This meant 2-3 LWB vans (Manchester bylaw does not permit LWB vans in excess of 3.5T to park on a residential street overnight) that were used for the tenant's business regularly remaining on the road and blocking driveways, particularly those with dropped curbs. No approach to the tenant stopped this behaviour during the 3 year period. The vans and cars caused obstruction and danger when exiting driveways at the very least even when they did not block driveways. This was along with additional cars belonging to the tenants. This affected around 10 households during the tenancy and was reported to the police and local Councillor on numerous occasions. We worry (as do others on the road near to us) that by extending the space, this would bring even further issues with parking and congestion if the intentions are to rent this out again.

Environmental Health – Requested a gas membrane condition be attached. Agent then sent through details of a visqueen membrane and the Environmental Health officer stated this was acceptable and a condition has been attached requiring later verification of installation.

Policies

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan but certain policies are still considered of relevance:

- Policy DC1 - Residential Extensions

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012:

- Policy DM1 - Development Management
- Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2018)

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with the principles of these policy documents.

Issues

Principle – The principle of building a part single, part two storey rear extension to provide additional living space for a family dwellinghouse is acceptable, however consideration must be given to the proposals siting, scale and massing, appearance and impact upon existing levels of residential and visual amenity.

Siting, scale and massing – The extension, sited to the rear of the property, facing south-east, would project 3.7m at both ground floor and first floor, with a width of 5.63m at ground floor and 4.71m at first floor. The single storey aspect would have an eaves height of 2.75m and a maximum height of 3.7m and the first floor aspect would have eaves to match the existing house with a ridge set 0.9m lower than the main roof. The ground floor would be sited 0.15m from the boundary shared with the adjoining semi, No.29, and the first floor element would be sited 1.95m from the boundary with No.29 and 1.3m from the boundary with No.25. Originally the proposal was to have a depth of 4m, however this was deemed excessive given the small gap between these properties and the lack of precedence along Homestead Crescent, hence negotiations took place with the agent to reduce the scale of the first floor element. The first floor, at 3.7m in depth is now considered appropriate. Although the depth of both floors exceeds

that which is stipulated within policy DC1 (3.65m) it is only by 0.05m, which is not deemed significant. The roof is hipped and the highest point lies almost a metre below the main ridge, thus the extension is considered subservient to the main house is sited appropriately, pursuant to policies DC1, DM1 and SP1.

Appearance and visual amenity – The extensions would be constructed of materials to match the existing house, including red brickwork, red roof tiles and uPVC windows/doors. The rear elevation would feature a hipped roof over the first floor and a mono-pitched roof containing a rooflight over the ground floor. The rear elevation would contain a bedroom window at first floor and a glazed double door, with small side windows at ground floor, opening onto the garden. The side elevation facing No.25 would contain a kitchen window at ground floor and a bathroom window at first floor. Homestead Crescent does not feature many larger extensions, but lots of single storey rear extensions, whilst nearby Kingsway features many larger additions. However as the extension is sited at the rear and the gaps between properties is narrow, it would not be readily visible from the public highway due to the gap between properties, thus the character of the area is not thought to be significantly altered or harmed by these works. The proposed materials are to match and the design is to be expected of such development, therefore the appearance of the development is considered acceptable and is not thought to cause undue harm to visual amenity.

Residential amenity – As the gardens face south-east along this road and the adjoining semi No.29 is sited south-west of the proposal, the neighbouring occupiers should not experience a significant loss of sunlight following the development. In addition to this, both adjacent neighbours feature their own 3m (approx.) single storey rear extensions. The side elevations are blank aside from a small obscure glazed bathroom window (controlled by a condition), therefore a loss of privacy and overlooking are also not deemed an issue. Due to the scale of the revised design and its orientation, it is not considered that the proposal would cause undue harm to residential amenity and in addition to this, no objections were received from the local residents notified of the application. An objection and neutral comment were received, regarding the previous rental tenants of this property and issues with on-street parking, numbers of visitors and lack of up-keep by the landlord or occupiers in the past. Neither comment related to the extension itself, other than worries that an additional (4th) bedroom in a family house would make these issues worse. However, the use of the property is C3 and the Council cannot control who the landlord lets it to (as long as it is covered by the C3 use) and the property retains it's driveway, whereby only 1 space is requires for a single family dwelling.

Conclusion – The proposal broadly complies with policies DM1, DC1, SP1 and the NPPF and although it received an objection, the issues raised are not considered so significant to warrant refusal. The revised proposal is not thought to significantly harm the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers nor harm the visual amenity of the house or wider area. The works are deemed acceptable and development may commence in accordance with the following conditions.

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations

This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have a right to a fair hearing and to this end the local planning authority must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved polices of the Unitary Development

Plan, the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing has concluded that some rights conferred by these articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the recommendation given is proportionate to the wider benefits of and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation: Approve

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. Issues have arisen during the consideration of this application and the officer negotiated with the applicant/agent to reach a satisfactory resolution.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the revised drawing numbered 'NA-P02', stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the 2nd November 2020.

Reason - To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, as stated on the submitted application form.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the building to be extended is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the extension, pursuant to saved policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

4) When the development commences, it shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents:

- Visqueen datasheet
- Section drawing

Received on the 1st November 2020.

Following this Completion/Verification Report or evidence of their installation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority following completion of the development.

Reason - To ensure that appropriate remedial action is taken in the interests of public safety, pursuant to policies DM1 and EN18 of the Core Strategy.

5) Before first occupation the proposed first floor window in the north-east side elevation, facing No.25 Homestead Crescent, shall be obscure glazed to a specification of no less than level 5 of the Pilkington Glass Scale or such other alternative equivalent and shall remain so in perpetuity.

Reason - To protect the amenity and living conditions of adjacent residential property from overlooking or perceived overlooking and in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

29 Homestead Crescent, Manchester, M19 1GJ
25 Homestead Crescent, Manchester, M19 1GJ
44 Homestead Crescent, Manchester, M19 1QL
456 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1QJ
458 Kingsway, Manchester, M19 1QJ
46 Homestead Crescent, Manchester, M19 1QL

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - All Exceeding 90M
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less)
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH